

REMARKS**Overview**

Claims 22-25 and 32-37 are pending in this application. Claim 22 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The present response is an earnest effort to place all claims in proper form for immediate allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issuance is therefore respectfully requested.

Issues Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner indicated that the claims contained subject matter which is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor at the time the application was filed had possession of the claimed invention (Office Action, page 2). In particular, the Examiner indicated that there was no literal support for the limitation "1100° C" in claim 22 despite the fact that this temperature is present in Figure 1. Therefore, the Applicant has amended claim 22 to refer to a temperature of 1000° C as was found in previous claims. Therefore, no additional search is required. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that these rejections should be withdrawn.

Issues Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22-25 and 32-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over GB 2242203. These rejections are respectfully traversed. The Examiner recognizes that GB 2242203 does not disclose using Ni powder as a starting material and heating the Ni -Pt alloy

in N-1%H₂ atmosphere, and the product having an oxidation resistance property above 500° C.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that these rejections must be withdrawn.

First, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The Examiner has not shown that the product produced by GB 2242203 is identical or substantially identical because GB 2242203 does not specify the oxidation resistance property.

The oxidation resistance property is not merely an insignificant property, but rather is at the heart of the invention. Moreover, as the Examiner appears to understand, all mixtures of 90% Nickel and 10% Platinum are not going to have the oxidation resistance property of the present invention. Thus, even though GB 2242203 discloses a 95% Nickel, 5% Platinum alloy this, is insufficient to show an alloy having the claimed characteristic. Thus, the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness and this rejection must be withdrawn.

GB 2242203 does not disclose the oxidation resistance property of the present invention as claimed. Moreover, the oxidation resistance property of the present invention is not necessarily present in the composition disclosed in GB 2242203. As the oxidation resistance property is not necessarily present, it is not inherently present and these rejections must be withdrawn.

In order to achieve the oxidation resistance of the present invention, it is believed that instead of forming a homogenous alloy, the Pt forms an "eggshell" structure around the Ni particles, the "shell" composed of a Pt rich alloy and the interior of the egg composed of a Ni rich alloy. This structure allows Ni to be protected against oxidation with a minimum quantity of Pt. This eggshell structure of the present invention is formed in part due to the presence of the Nickel powder with the Pt resinate. GB 2242203, on the other hand, forms the Pt/Ni alloy from

resinates, that is, solutions containing Pt and Ni ions. As the Pt and Ni are already intimately mixed before the mixture is heated one would expect the Ni resinate/Pt resinate mixture to produce a more homogenous alloy than in the present invention. A homogenous alloy with 10% or less Pt would not be expected to produce the oxidation resistance of the present invention.

Thus, the difference in the form of the reactants and the difference in the process can result in a different product. The difference in reactants (Nickel powder versus Nickel resinate), as used here and in the steps performed results in a different structure than a homogeneous alloy. Thus, not only does GB 2242203 not disclose the oxidation resistance property of the present invention, GB 2242203 does not disclose a process that would necessarily lead to a product with the lack of homogeneity of the claimed invention as GB 2242203 does not use a Nickel powder or an identical process. Thus, the prior art, by using a different process and a different form of Nickel reactant, does not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics attributed to the claimed product. Therefore, these rejections must all be withdrawn and the Examiner should find all claims in proper form for immediate allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issuance is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

No fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this amendment; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 26-0084.

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

John D. Goodhue

JOHN D. GOODHUE, Reg. No. 47,603
McKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.
801 Grand Avenue, Suite 3200
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-2721
Phone No: (515) 288-3667
Fax No: (515) 288-1338
CUSTOMER NO: 22885

Attorneys of Record

- bja -